

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-34 stand rejected by the Office Action dated December 2, 2005. Assignee respectfully traverses herein the rejections of claims 1-34.

The Specification

The specification was amended to correct a typographical error. No additional matter was added.

The Claims

Claims 1-17 and 20-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodrill (US006738803B1) and in view of Pickering (US006704708B1). Claims 18-19 and 33-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodrill in view of Pickering and further in view of DaCosta (US006665658B1). Claims 1 and 20 were amended to correct an antecedent basis error and do not constitute a narrowing amendment. The rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a computer-implemented voice application indexing method for supplying voice applications that provide telephony services to users. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that voice application data is received over a network and is stored in a database in accordance with a predetermined voice application taxonomy. Taxonomy implies a classification structure whereby multiple voice applications can be searched according to search criteria. Examples disclosed in Assignee's specification include classifications based upon required speech engine

resources, required telephony resources, required telephony markup language, and required application server environment.

The office action asserts on page 3 that such limitations of claim 1 are disclosed in Dodrill. More specifically, the office action cites to Dodrill, col. 8, lines 1-14, lines 54-67 regarding claim 1's step of storing in a database the voice application data in accordance with a predetermined voice application taxonomy. Assignee respectfully disagrees. Dodrill, col. 8, lines 1-14, lines 54-67 reads as follows:

In particular, the application server 66 may either access static XML pages, or the application server 66 may access stored XML application pages (i.e., pages that define an application) and in response generate new XML pages during runtime and supply the generated XML pages to the web server 64. Since multiple transactions may need to occur between the browser 56 or 62 and the application server 66, the application server 66 may store for each existing session a data record, referred to as a "brownie", that identifies the state of the existing session; hence, the application server 66 can instantiate a procedure, return the necessary data, and terminate the procedure without the necessity of maintaining the instance running throughout the entire user session.

[...]

As shown in FIG. 4, the web server 64, the application server 66, and the voice web applications 68 reside within a gateserver 92. The gateserver 92 includes a browser based XML editor tool 94 that enables a web programmer to design voice applications using XML pages, described below. The XML pages are stored as XML applications and functions 96, for example within a database accessible by the application server 66. The XML pages stored within the XML application and functions 96 may be stored as static pages to be fetched by the web server 64 and supplied to a browser, however the XML pages may also define the actual application to be executed by the application server 66 in runtime. Hence, the application server 66 may execute stored XML applications and functions 96, and in response generate dynamic HTML having XML tags, also referred to as HTML/XML pages.

These cited passages from Dodrill disclose that XML pages are stored as XML applications and functions 96 within a database accessible by an application server. Moreover Dodrill discloses that the application server may also execute a stored XML application and function in order to

generate dynamic HTML having XML tags. However nowhere within these passages from Dodrill is there a storage in a database of data that is to be used to determine which application is to be used as required by claim 1. Instead Dodrill discloses storage of an actual application (i.e., XML application) which when executed can generate another application. Moreover, the XML application that is stored in the database in Dodrill is not received over a network. This is in contrast to what is required in claim 1 which requires that the data (i.e., voice application data) to be stored in the database is data that has been received over a network. Because such limitations of claim 1 are not found in Dodrill (whether viewed alone or in combination with any other cited reference), claim 1 is allowable and should proceed to issuance. Because claim 1 is allowable, claims 2-19 which depend from claim 1 are also allowable and should proceed to issuance.

Claim 20 is allowable over the cited references. Claim 20 recites a voice application data structure that contains voice application data that is received over a network, and a database that stores the received voice application data in accordance with a predetermined voice application taxonomy. Because Dodrill does not disclose (whether viewed alone or in combination with any other cited reference) such limitations of claim 20, claim 20 is allowable and should proceed to issuance. Because claim 20 is allowable, claims 21-34 which depend from claim 20 are also allowable and should proceed to issuance.


For the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits that claims 1-34 are in condition for allowance.

[Continued on the next page.]

CONCLUSION

To the extent that there are any remaining issues in this application, the undersigned invites the Examiner to conduct a telephonic interview to resolve such issues. If not, the Assignee respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John V. Biernacki
Reg. No. 40,511
JONES DAY
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-3939